

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/017,295	IGARASHI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Sean Reilly	2153	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Sean Reilly (Examiner). (3) _____.

(2) Damond Vadnais (Applicant's Representative). (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 12 June 2006.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Marlin (U.S. Patent 5,778,377), "Windows 95 printer driver operation manual," and Rowe (U.S. Patent Number 5,737,599).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Examiner indicated that the amendments to the claims as submitted on May 8, 2006 do not overcome the prior art of record and moreover the arguments submitted on May 8, 2006 are not persuasive. Examiner indicated that further search would be preformed prior to mailing a response to the communication filed on May 8, 2006. Examiner agreed to issue a NON-FINAL action if better art is discovered and a new grounds of rejection is set forth since the scope of the amended claims are similar in scope to the claims previously presented. Examiner also agreed to wait two weeks from the date of this interview before responding to the response filed on May 8, 2006 in order to provide Applicant time to overcome some 112 2nd paragraph issues identified during this interview.